

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**GARY ALLEN GLIDDEN #145432**

**PETITIONER**

**v.**

**CAUSE NO. 1:12CV62 LG-JMR**

**E.L. SPARKMAN, ET AL.**

**RESPONDENTS**

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This cause comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation [15] of Chief United States Magistrate Judge John M. Roper entered in this cause on May 31, 2012. Magistrate Judge Roper reviewed Glidden's Motions for Bond and to consolidate motions. He found the motion to consolidate moot. As for the motion for bond, he reviewed the applicable law and found that there are no extraordinary circumstances presented by Glidden's incarceration to necessitate the granting of bail while his federal habeas corpus petition is under review. Accordingly, he recommended that the motion for bond be denied.

Glidden agreed with Magistrate Judge Roper's finding that the motion to consolidate was moot, but objected to the recommendation on the motion for bond. When any party objects to a Report and Recommendation, the Court must review it *de novo*. See *Kreimerman v. Casa Veerkamp, S.A. de C.V.*, 22 F.3d 634, 646 (5th Cir. 1994); *Longmire v. Guste*, 921 F.2d 620, 623 (5th Cir. 1991). Such a review means that the Court will examine the record and make an independent assessment of the law. The Court need not, however, conduct a *de novo* review when the objections are frivolous, conclusive, or general in nature. *Battle v. United States Parole Comm'n*, 834 F.2d 419, 421 (5th Cir. 1987).

In his response to the Report and Recommendation, Glidden reasserts his arguments regarding the unlawfulness of his incarceration, asking the Court to review the documents he previously presented in support of his request for “release on his own personal recognizance in the interests of justice.” (Pet. Resp. 3, ECF No. 17). He offers neither any new argument to support his original motion nor any evidence to establish that the Magistrate Judge’s analysis and conclusions were incorrect. Therefore, a *de novo* review of Glidden’s objections is unnecessary. Instead, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and finds it is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989). It will therefore be adopted as the findings and conclusions of this Court.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that the Report and Recommendation [15] of Chief United States Magistrate Judge John M. Roper entered in this cause on May 31, 2012, should be, and the same hereby is, **ADOPTED** as the findings and conclusions of this Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Petitioner’s Motion for Bond [9] is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Petitioner’s Motion to consolidate [10] is **DENIED** as moot.

**SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** this the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2012.

s/ Louis Guirola, Jr.  
LOUIS GUIROLA, JR.  
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE